BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:)
EARL C. JENKINS, M.D. Certificate No. A-25009) No. D-5044
Respondent.))

DECISION

The attached Stipulated Settlement is hereby adopted by the Division of Medical Quality as its Decision in the above-entitled matter.

This Decision shall become effective on <u>September 16, 1994</u>.

IT IS OR ORDERED <u>August 17, 1994</u>

By:

ALAN SHUMACHER, M.D.

Secretary

Division of Medical Quality

```
DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General
      of the State of California
    JANA L. TUTON
      Supervising Deputy Attorney General
   ROBERT C. MILLER
      Deputy Attorney General
    1515 K Street, Suite 511
    P. O. Box 944255
    Sacramento, CA 94244-2550
 5
    Telephone: (916) 324-5161
 6
   Attorneys for Complainant
 7
 8
                 BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
                       MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
                      DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
 9
                           STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10
11
                                           No. D-5044
    In the Matter of the
12
    Accusation Against:
                                           STIPULATION IN SETTLEMENT
13
       EARL C. JENKINS, M.D.
       1068 S. 7th Street, No. 124
       Avenal, CA 93204
14.
       Physician's and Surgeon's
15
       Certificate No. A-25009
16
              Respondent.
17
              Respondent Earl C. Jenkins, M.D., through his counsel
18
19
    Richard K. Turner, and the Medical Board of California, Division
20
    of Medical Quality, through its counsel, Deputy Attorney General
    Robert C. Miller, do hereby enter into the following stipulation:
21
22
                  Dixon Arnett, the Executive Director of the Medical
    Board of California (hereinafter "Board") filed accusation number
24
    D-5044 solely in his official capacity.
25
                  On November 28, 1992, the Board issued Physician's
              2.
26
    and Surgeon's Certificate Number A-25009 to Earl C. Jenkins
27
    / / /
```

- 3. Respondent has read and understands the charges contained in the accusation. Respondent has been advised by his counsel, Mr. Turner, of the charges and possible defenses. Respondent understands that those charges, if found to be true, constitute cause for disciplinary action.
- 4. Respondent understands that he has a right to a hearing on the charges contained in the accusation, to reconsideration, to appeal, and to any and all rights accorded him by the Administrative Procedure Act and Code of Civil Procedure. Respondent hereby freely and voluntarily waives those rights in order to enter into this stipulation as a resolution of the pending accusation against him.
- 5. It is expressly understood by the parties that the admissions made herein are for the purposes of this proceeding or other proceeding before the Board and may not be used for any other purpose.
- 6. Subject to the proviso in item 5 above, respondent admits as true the allegations contained in paragraphs 20 through 26A (except paragraph 28B) of accusation number D-5044.

 (Attached as exhibit A.)
- 7. Based on the waivers and admissions made herein, the Division of Medical Quality of the Board may issue the following decision:

Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number A-25009, heretofore issued to Earl C. Jenkins, M.D., is hereby revoked;

provided, however, that said revocation is stayed, and respondent is placed on probation for a period of five (5) years upon the following terms and conditions:

- (A) As part of probation, respondent is suspended from the practice of medicine for thirty (30) days beginning the effective date of this decision.
- (B) Within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall undergo a psychiatric evaluation (and psychological testing, if deemed necessary) by a Division-appointed psychiatrist who shall furnish a psychiatric report to the Division or its designee.

If respondent is required by the Division or its designee to undergo psychiatric treatment, respondent shall within thirty (30) days of the requirement notice submit to the Division for its prior approval the name and qualifications of a psychiatrist of respondent's choice. Upon approval of the treating psychiatrist, respondent shall undergo and continue psychiatric treatment until further notice from the Division. Respondent shall have the treating psychiatrist submit quarterly status reports to the Division.

(C) Within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall be evaluated by the Division's Diversion Program. If the Diversion Evaluation Committee determines that respondent is in need of Diversion, he shall enroll and participate in the Division's Diversion Program. Quitting the program without permission or being expelled for cause shall constitute a violation of probation by respondent.

- (E) Orders forbidding respondent from personal use or possession of controlled substances or dangerous drugs do not apply to medications lawfully prescribed to respondent for a bona fide illness or condition by another practitioner.
- (F) Respondent shall maintain a record of all controlled substances prescribed, dispensed or administered by respondent during probation, showing all the following: (1) the name of the patient, (2) the date, (3) the character and quantity of controlled substances involved, and (4) the indications and diagnosis for which the controlled substance was furnished.

Respondent shall keep these records in a separate file or ledger, in chronological order, and shall make them available for inspection and copying by the Division or its designee, upon request.

(G) Within sixty (60) days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall submit to the Division for its prior approval a community service program in which respondent

shall provide free medical services on a regular basis to a community or charitable facility or agency for at least 10 hours a month for the first 24 months of probation. Respondent is not required to perform services for any agency which does not have errors and omissions insurance.

1.3

- (H) Within ninety (90) days of the effective date of this decision, and on an annual basis thereafter, respondent shall submit to the Division for its prior approval an educational program or course to be designated by the Division, which shall not be less than forty (40) hours per year, for the each year of probation. This program shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education requirements for re-licensure. Following the completion of each course, the Division or its designee may administer an examination to test respondent's knowledge of the course. Respondent shall provide proof of attendance for sixty-five (65) hours of continuing medical education of which forty (40) hours were in satisfaction of this condition and were approved in advance by the Division.
- (I) Within sixty (60) days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall submit to the Division for its prior approval a course in Ethics, which respondent shall successfully complete during the first year of probation.
- (J) Within sixty (60) days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall take and pass an oral or written exam, in a subject area of pharmacology to be administered by the Division or its designee. If respondent fails this examination, respondent must take and pass a re-examination consisting of a

written as well as an oral examination. The waiting period between repeat examinations shall be at three-month intervals until success is achieved. Respondent shall pay the cost of the first examination and any subsequent re-examinations.

If respondent fails the first examination, respondent shall cease the practice of medicine until the re-examination has been successfully passed, and has been so notified by the Division in writing. Failure to pass the required examination no later than 100 days prior to the termination date of probation shall constitute a violation of probation.

(K) Within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall submit to the Division for its prior approval a plan of practice in which respondent's practice shall be monitored by another physician in respondent's field of practice at each of respondent's places of employment, who shall provide quarterly reports to the Division.

If the monitor resigns or is no longer available, respondent shall, within fifteen (15) days, move to have a new monitor appointed, through nomination by respondent and approval by the Division.

Respondent is prohibited from engaging in solo practice.

- (L) Respondent shall pay to the Division investigation and prosecution costs in the amount of two thousand dollars (\$2,000).
- (M) Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws and all rules governing the practice of medicine in California.

- (O) Respondent shall comply with the Division's probation surveillance program.
- (P) Respondent shall appear in person for interviews with the Division's medical consultant upon request at various intervals and with reasonable notice.
- (Q) The period of probation shall not run during the time respondent is residing or practicing outside the jurisdiction of California. If, during probation, respondent moves out of the jurisdiction of California to reside or practice elsewhere, respondent is required to immediately notify the Division in writing of the date of departure, and the date of return, if any.
- (R) Upon successful completion of probation, respondent's certificate will be fully restored.
- (S) If respondent violates probation in any respect, the Division, after giving notice and opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary order that was stayed. If an accusation or petition to revoke probation is filed against respondent during probation, the Division shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of probation shall be extended until the matter is final.
- 8. Respondent may not withdraw this stipulation prior to the Board's formal action on the stipulation. In the event

1	this stipulation is not adopted by the Board, it shall have no
2	force of effect on any party.
3	Dated: <u>22/94</u>
4	DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General of the State of California
5	JANA L. TUTON
6	Supervising Deputy Attorney General
7	Athan March
8	ROBERT C. MILLER Deputy Attorney General
9	
10	Attorneys for Complainant
11	Dated: 6.6.94
12	
13	RICHARD K. TURNER
14	
15	Attorney for Respondent
16	Dated: 6/2/64
17	
18	EARL C. JENKINS, M.D.
19	
20	Respondent
21	
22	
23	
24	

```
DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General
1
     of the State of California
2
   JANA L. TUTON
     Supervising Deputy Attorney General
   ROBERT C. MILLER
3
     Deputy Attorney General
   1515 K Street, Suite 511
4
   P. O. Box 944255
   Sacramento, CA 94244-2550
5
   Telephone: (916) 324-5161
6
   Attorneys for Complainant
 7
                  BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
 8
                       MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
                      DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
 9
                           STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10
11
                                           No. 5044
    In the Matter of the
    Accusation Against:
12
                                           AMENDED ACCUSATION
13
       EARL C. JENKINS, M.D.
       1068 S. 7th Street, No. 124
       Avenal, CA 93204
14
15
       Physician's and Surgeon's
       Certificate No. A-25009
16
              Respondent.
17
              Dixon Arnett, the complainant herein, alleges as
18
    follows:
19
              1. He is the Executive Director of the Medical Board
20
    of California and makes and files this accusation in his official
21
22
    capacity as such and not otherwise.
                   On or about November 28, 1972, respondent Earl C.
23
    Jenkins, M.D. was issued physician's and surgeon's certificate
24
    No. A-25009 under the laws of the State of California. The
25
    certificate is current in full force and effect.
26
27
    / / /
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 4. Section 725 of the Code provides that repeated acts of clearly excessive prescribing or administering of drugs as determined by the standard of the community of licensees is unprofessional conduct.
- 5. Section 2241 of the Code provides that prescribing controlled substances to habitual users or addicts is unprofessional conduct.
- 6. Section 2242, subdivision (a) of the Code provides that prescribing controlled substances without a good faith prior examination is unprofessional conduct.
- 7. Section 2239, subdivision (a) of the Code provides that the self-prescribing or use of a controlled substance is unprofessional conduct.

$\underline{s.m.}^{\underline{1/}}$

8. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged hereafter:

^{1.} To protect patient privacy, the patient is referred to by initials. Disclosure of the full name will be provided to respondent pursuant to a timely request for discovery.

- B. Respondent violated section 725 of the Code in that the total amount of drugs prescribed and dispensed to S.M. constituted clearly excessive prescribing of drugs as determined by the standard of the community of licensees.
- C. Respondent violated section 2234, subdivision (b), of the Code, gross negligence, in his overall treatment of S.M. by keeping inadequate records; failing to conduct a good faith physical examination or conducting incomplete physical examinations to provide a medical basis for the drugs prescribed; failing to employ other, non-drug treatment, options; and by having S.M. sign an incomplete and misleading treatment consent form.

M.C.

- 9. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged hereafter:
- A. Respondent commenced treatment of patient M.C. in February 1988. From February 1988 through December 1989, respondent continuously prescribed and dispensed Demerol, Phenergran, Oxycodone, Methadone, and Morphine to M.C.
- B. Respondent violated section 725 of the Code in that the total amount of drugs prescribed and dispensed to M.C.

constituted clearly excessive prescribing of drugs as determined by the standard of the community of licensees.

C. Respondent violated section 2234, subdivision (b), of the Code, gross negligence, in his overall treatment of M.C. by keeping inadequate records; failing to conduct a good faith physical examination or conducting incomplete physical examinations to provide a medical basis for the drugs prescribed; failing to employ other, non-drug treatment, options; and by having M.C. sign an incomplete and misleading treatment consent form.

B.B.

- 10. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged hereafter:
- A. Respondent commenced treatment of B.B. in January 1989. From January 1989 through October 1989, respondent continuously prescribed and dispensed Demerol, Phenergran, and Codeine with Acetaminophen to B.B.
- B. Respondent violated section 725 of the Code in that the total amount of drugs prescribed and dispensed to B.B. constituted clearly excessive prescribing of drugs as determined by the standard of the community of licensees.
- C. Respondent violated section 2234, subdivision (b), of the Code, gross negligence, in his overall treatment of B.B. by keeping inadequate records; failing to conduct a good faith physical examination or conducting incomplete physical examinations to provide a medical basis for the drugs prescribed;

failing to employ other, non-drug treatment, options; and by having B.B. sign an incomplete and misleading treatment consent form. G.R.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged hereafter:
- Respondent commenced treatment of G.R. in January Α. From January 1986 through December 1989, respondent continuously prescribed and dispensed Demerol, Xanax, Stadol, and Methadone to G.R.
- Respondent violated section 725 of the Code in в. that the total amount of drugs prescribed and dispensed to G.R. constituted clearly excessive prescribing of drugs as determined by the standard of the community of licensees.
- Respondent violated section 2234, subdivision (b), c. of the Code, gross negligence, in his overall treatment of G.R. by keeping inadequate records; failing to conduct a good faith physical examination or conducting incomplete physical examinations to provide a medical basis for the drugs prescribed; failing to employ other, non-drug treatment, options; and by having G.R. sign an incomplete and misleading treatment consent form.

W.K.

Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged hereafter:

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Respondent commenced treatment of W.K. in June Α. From June 1988 through August 1989, respondent continuously prescribed and dispensed Dilaudid, Demerol, and Phenergran to W.K.

- Respondent violated section 725 of the Code in В. that the total amount of drugs prescribed and dispensed to W.K. constituted clearly excessive prescribing of drugs as determined by the standard of the community of licensees.
- Respondent violated section 2234, subdivision (b), of the Code, gross negligence, in his overall treatment of W.K. by keeping inadequate records; failing to conduct a good faith physical examination or conducting incomplete physical examinations to provide a medical basis for the drugs prescribed; failing to employ other, non-drug treatment, options; and by having W.K. sign an incomplete and misleading treatment consent form.

R.B.

- Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged hereafter:
- Respondent commenced treatment of R.B. in May From May 1988 through January 1990, respondent continuously prescribed and dispensed Demerol and Morphine to R.B.
- Respondent violated section 725 of the Code in в. that the total amount of drugs prescribed and dispensed to R.B. / / /

C. Respondent violated section 2234, subdivision (b), of the Code, gross negligence, in his overall treatment of R.B. by keeping inadequate records; failing to conduct a good faith physical examination or conducting incomplete physical examinations to provide a medical basis for the drugs prescribed; failing to employ other, non-drug treatment, options; and by having R.B. sign an incomplete and misleading treatment consent form.

B.B.

- 14. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged hereafter:
- A. Respondent commenced treatment of B.B. in June 1988. From June 1988 through March 1990, respondent continuously prescribed and dispensed Demerol, Phenergran, Percodan, and Valium to B.B.
- B. Respondent violated section 725 of the Code in that the total amount of drugs prescribed and dispensed to B.B. constituted clearly excessive prescribing of drugs as determined by the standard of the community of licensees.
- C. Respondent violated section 2234, subdivision (b), of the Code, gross negligence, in his overall treatment of B.B. by keeping inadequate records; failing to conduct a good faith physical examination or conducting incomplete physical examinations to provide a medical basis for the drugs prescribed;

- 1	·
1	failing to employ other, non-drug treatment, options; and by
2	having B.B. sign an incomplete and misleading treatment consent
3	form.
4	N.W.
5	15. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action
6	pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged
7	hereafter:
8.	A. Respondent commenced treatment of N.W. in March
9	1988. From March 1988 through August 1989, respondent
0	continuously prescribed and dispensed Demerol to N.W.
11	B. Respondent violated section 725 of the Code in
12	that the total amount of drugs prescribed and dispensed to N.W.
L3	constituted clearly excessive prescribing of drugs as determined
14	by the standard of the community of licensees.
15	C. Respondent violated section 2234, subdivision (b),
16	of the Code, gross negligence, in his overall treatment of N.W.
17	by keeping inadequate records; failing to conduct a good faith
18	physical examination or conducting incomplete physical
19	examinations to provide a medical basis for the drugs prescribed;
20	failing to employ other, non-drug treatment, options; and by
21	having N.W. sign an incomplete and misleading treatment consent
22	form.
23	S.W.
	16 Respondent is subject to disciplinary action

16. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged hereafter:

27 / / /

25

- B. Respondent violated section 725 of the Code in that the total amount of drugs prescribed and dispensed to S.W. constituted clearly excessive prescribing of drugs as determined by the standard of the community of licensees.
- C. Respondent violated section 2234, subdivision (b), of the Code, gross negligence, in his overall treatment of S.W. by keeping inadequate records; failing to conduct a good faith physical examination or conducting incomplete physical examinations to provide a medical basis for the drugs prescribed; failing to employ other, non-drug treatment, options; and by having S.W. sign an incomplete and misleading treatment consent form.

D.H.

- 17. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged hereafter:
- A. Respondent commenced treatment of D.H. in October 1988. From October 1988 through October 1989, respondent continuously prescribed and dispensed Codeine and Hydrocodone to D.H.
- B. Respondent violated section 725 of the Code in that the total amount of drugs prescribed and dispensed to D.H.

constituted clearly excessive prescribing of drugs as determined by the standard of the community of licensees.

C. Respondent violated section 2234, subdivision (b), of the Code, gross negligence, in his overall treatment of D.H. by keeping inadequate records; failing to conduct a good faith physical examination or conducting incomplete physical examinations to provide a medical basis for the drugs prescribed; failing to employ other, non-drug treatment, options; and by having D.H. sign an incomplete and misleading treatment consent form.

K.T.

- 18. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged hereafter:
- A. Respondent commenced treatment of K.T. in March 1989. From March 1989 through March 1990, respondent continuously prescribed and dispensed Methadone, Vicodin, and Percodan to K.T.
- B. Respondent violated section 725 of the Code in that the total amount of drugs prescribed and dispensed to K.T. constituted clearly excessive prescribing of drugs as determined by the standard of the community of licensees.
- C. Respondent violated section 2234, subdivision (b), of the Code, gross negligence, in his overall treatment of K.T. by keeping inadequate records; failing to conduct a good faith physical examination or conducting incomplete physical examinations to provide a medical basis for the drugs prescribed;

failing to employ other, non-drug treatment, options; and by 1 having K.T. sign an incomplete and misleading treatment consent 2 form. 3 D.D. 4 Respondent is subject to disciplinary action 19. 5 pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged 6 hereafter: 7 Respondent commenced treatment of D.D. in December Α. 8 From December 1987 through September 1989, respondent 9 continuously prescribed and dispensed Fiorinal and Codeine to 10 11 D.D. Respondent violated section 725 of the Code in 12 в. that the total amount of drugs prescribed and dispensed to D.D. 13 constituted clearly excessive prescribing of drugs as determined 14 by the standard of the community of licensees. 15 Respondent violated section 2234, subdivision (b), 16 of the Code, gross negligence, in his overall treatment of D.D. 17 by keeping inadequate records; failing to conduct a good faith 18 physical examination or conducting incomplete physical 19 examinations to provide a medical basis for the drugs prescribed; 20 failing to employ other, non-drug treatment, options; and by 21 having D.D. sign an incomplete and misleading treatment consent 22 23 form.

<u>L.B.</u>

24

25

26

27

20. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged hereafter:

	in the contract of the contrac
1	B. Respondent violated section 2239, subdivision (a)
2	of the Code, self-prescribing, in that the Fastin prescribed for
3	G.W. on March 24, 1992 was never received by her.
4	<u>K.J.</u>
5	23. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action
6	pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged
7	hereafter:
8	A. On April 30, 1992, June 16, 1992, and July 16,
9	1991, respondent violated section 2242, subdivision (a), by
LO	prescribing Fastin, a schedule IV controlled substance to K.J.
11	without a good faith examination.
L2	<u>D.J.</u>
13	24. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action
14	pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged
15	hereafter:
16	A. On May 20, 1992, respondent violated section 2242,
17	subdivision (a) of the Code by prescribing Tylenol No. 3 for D.J.
18	without a good faith examination.
19	B. Respondent violated section 2241 of the Code by
20	prescribing Tylenol No. 3 to D.J. who is a habitual user.
21	<u>s.r.</u>
22	25. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action
23	pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged
24	hereafter:
25	A. Respondent violated section 2242, subdivision (a)
26	by prescribing Fastin, a schedule IV controlled substance, to
27	S.R. without a good faith examination.

pursuant to section 2234 of the Code as more particularly alleged

1992, respondent violated section 2242, subdivision (a) of the

Respondent is subject to disciplinary action

On March 24, 1992, April 30, 1992, and June 1,

26.

fully set forth at this point.

3

4

hereafter:

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

26

27

Code by prescribing Fastin, a schedule IV controlled substance to L.B. without a good faith examination.

27. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the Code in that he is guilty of

unprofessional conduct as more particularly alleged hereafter:

A. The factual allegations of paragraphs 5(A-C)

through 26(A), above, are incorporated by reference as though

B. The acts alleged in 5(A-C) through 26(A), or any combination thereof, constitute repeated negligent acts in violation of section 2234, subdivision (c), of the Code.

WHEREFORE complainant prays that the Division of Medical Quality hold a hearing on the matters alleged herein and following said hearing issue a decision:

- Suspending or revoking the physician and surgeon's certificate issued to respondent Earl C. Jenkins, M.D.;
- Prohibiting respondent from supervising a physician's assistant; and

l	1	
1		3. Taking such other and further action as may be
2	proper.	1 /2/02 (DA 10 00 M
3		DATED: 6/23/93 Johnt Medin
4		DIXON ARNETT
. 5		Executive Director Medical Board of California
6		Department of Consumer Affairs State of California
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		FRED.
12		AMEGRA BROWN CONTROL OF THE CONTROL
13		OF The state of th
14		The state of the s
15		
16		
17	ŀ	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22	:	
	11	·